37. The program product as claimed in claim 33, wherein said plural items of information are information indicative of a current situation of a facility which contains plural parts and performs a predetermined process, and one of said plurality of information destination devices to which one of said plural items of information is transmitted is a controller which controls the predetermined process of said facility.

38. The program product as claimed in claim 33, wherein said event elapses of predetermined time intervals.--

REMARKS

The present Amendment cancels claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 24-26 and 28, amends claims 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23 and 27 and adds new claims 29-38. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23, 27 and 29-38.

Claims 11-19 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. As indicated above, claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 12, 13, 15 and 16 is rendered moot. The remaining claims 11, 14 and 17-19 were amended to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 11, 14 and 17-19 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone should any further indefinite matters be discovered so that appropriate amendments may be made.

Claims 11-28 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Miyazawa (U.S. patent No. 5,732,222). As indicated above, claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 24-24 and 28 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 21, 24-26 and 28 is rendered moot. This rejection with respect to the remaining claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27 are not taught or suggested by Miyazawa whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27 in order to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to applications that handle plural items of information which are correlated with one another and are distributed or exist at separate places in a system. According to the present invention, it is possible to collect the latest items or versions of such distributed information

and re-distributed such latest items or versions to various destination.

The present invention as now recited in the claims accomplishes this by providing a first information processing device which holds items of information and sends, upon occurrence of an event, one or more of the items of information corresponding to the event to a second information processing device interconnected with the first information processing device via transmission media. In the present invention, when an event has occurred the latest items or version of information is transmitted. Thus, for example, when the event is an update of an item of information, the updated or latest version of the item of information is distributed.

The above described features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Miyazawa whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Miyazawa teaches an election terminal apparatus such as that illustrated in Fig. 1 which allows a voter to operate a tablet unit 2 and 3 so as to designate a candidate for whom the voter wishes to vote. Miyazawa teaches that a CPU 12 first obtains, from a tablet controller 10, a coordinate of a position on a display (or transparent tablet 5) pointed to by a stylus pen 3 on the tablet 5, upon activation of the stylus pen 3. The CPU 12 then detects a candidate corresponding to the obtained coordinate from a region data buffer and the candidate stored in RAM 13, and obtains information correlated

with the detected candidate. Thereafter, the CPU 12 displays the information on a display device (integral type display/input unit), namely the tablet 5.

Thus, as is clear from the above, Miyazawa does not teach or suggest the transmission of information according to an event that has been detected as in Applicants invention. Miyazawa merely teaches that information corresponding to a candidate which corresponds to a coordinate on a display is retrieved and then displayed on the display device. Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Miyazawa that particular information is transmitted based upon the occurrence of an event as in the present invention.

Therefore, Miyazawa fails to teach or suggest storage means for storing plural items of information of plural sets of data for respective ones of plural items of information, each one of the plural sets of data including an event indicative of a change of situation, identification data for identifying information to be transmitted in response to the event, and transmission destination data indicative of one of the plurality of information destination devices to which a corresponding one of the plural items of information is to be transmitted as recited in the claims.

Further, Miyazawa fails to teach or suggest detection means for detecting that the event has occurred as recited in the claims.

Still further, Miyazawa fails to teach or suggest transmission means for transmitting, via the transmission media, one of the plural items of information identified by

the identification data corresponding to the event detected by the detection means to one of the plurality of information destination devices that is designated by the transmission destination data corresponding to the event as recited in the claims.

Thus, as per the above, it is clear that Miyazawa fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27 based on the Miyazawa reference.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 29-38. New claims 29-38 recite many of the same features shown above not to be taught or suggested by Miyazawa. Therefore, the same arguments presented above with respect to the use of Miyazawa to reject claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23 and 27 apply as well to the possible use of Miyazawa to reject claims 29-38.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 11-28.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 11, 14, 17-20, 22, 23, 27 and 29-38 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an Extension of Time. Please charge any shortage in fees due in

connection with the filing of this paper, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (566.36161CX1).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600